

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

In the Advisory Action mailed September 4, 2003, Examiner Liang indicated that the arguments presented in the August 20, 2003 Request for Reconsideration were not persuasive. In several follow-up telephone interviews with Examiner Liang and Supervisory Examiner Meier, additional arguments were presented which Examiner Liang found persuasive. In accordance with the recommendations made by Supervisory Examiner Meier in a September 23 telephone interview, this Supplemental Request for Reconsideration is being filed to make these additional arguments of record. Applicant hereby respectfully requests that based on the following Remarks, the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn, and that a new, non-Final Office Action be issued, or the application allowed.

The May 22 Office Action rejects claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,290,328; hereinafter "Yamada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Yamada deals exclusively with inkjet printers having inkjet nozzles, rather than impact printers having pins. Claim 1 recites "a pitch of pins of the printing head is not any one of an integral vertical resolution," and "each of a plurality of the pins provided in the vertical direction," and "preparing a raster-line/pin-relationship table in which the pin is to be actuated," and "printing the predetermined range by actuating the pins". Because Yamada deals with an inkjet printer rather than an impact printer, nowhere in Yamada are the "pins" disclosed.

As set forth in Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Company of California, (814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)), "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." Since Yamada deals with an inkjet printer, the element of "pins" is

neither expressly nor inherently described, and therefore claim 1 cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Yamada.


Similarly, claim 6 recites "a pitch of pins of the printing head" and "a raster-line/pin-relationship table describing pins to be actuated". These features are not disclosed in Yamada.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over the cited reference. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and claims 7-10 depend from claim 6. Therefore, each of claims 2-5 and 7-10 are patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 6, as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jaquelin K. Spong
Registration No. 52,241

RECEIVED
OCT 22 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

JAO:JKS/scg

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: October 22, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--